

Appendix A

Indian Creek Road Reconstruction Project Environmental Assessment

Summary of comments received during the 30-day public comment period on the Indian Creek Road Reconstruction Project Environmental Assessment

The legal notice announcing the availability of the Environmental Assessment (EA) was published in the Recorder Herald, Salmon, Idaho on January 29, 2004. The 30-day comment period ended on March 1, 2004. Table A below identifies those individuals who commented during the 30-day comment period.

Table A. Comments received on the Indian Creek Road Reconstruction Project during the 30-day comment period

Respondent Letter	Date Received or Postmarked	Respondent and their Affiliation
A	February 3, 2004 & June 9, 2003 & June 6, 2004	Jeff Juel, The Ecology Center, Inc. & Michael Garrity, Alliance for the Wild Rockies & Bill Worf
B	February 11, 2004	Tom Riley
C	February 19, 2004	Ronald & Roberta Meadville
D	February 19, 2004	Jack Briggs
E	February 20, 2004	Terry Blau
F	February 25, 2004	Larry Zuckerman
G	February 27, 2004	Patrick J. Farrell, Jr.
H	March 2 2004	Dick & Linda Wasia
I	March 3, 2004	Christopher H. Meyer

A summary of comments received are addressed below. The Respondent is denoted in parentheses () by the letter which corresponds to the Respondent letter in Table A. Following the identifying letter are the comments provided. Because some comments contain lengthy narratives, only that portion of those comments that capture the issue of the Respondent is provided. Comment correspondences are available for review at the North Fork Ranger District office. Comments are grouped by Respondent.

Respondent (A): Please consider the issues raised in the Ecology Center's June 6, 2003 comment letter and our April 27, 2000 comment letter the proposed Indian Creek Stream Restoration Project.

1. Please consider the potential of the new location to erode or mass waste into the stream, and the impacts on native fish and aquatic habitat.
2. Please analyze the cumulative impacts of the increased motorized use in the area due to the road upgrade.
3. Complete the Roads Analysis Process (RAP) as part of the NEPA process
4. Consider economics from all angles.
5. Insure that habitat for spawning steelhead, bull trout, and salmon are protected.
6. Address the bridge concerns on Indian Creek.
7. There does not appear to be justification to spend scarce Forest Service resources on a project that will primarily benefit private land interests.
8. If you determine that a public right of way exists across NF land issue a permit to the County or the private landowner to do the construction at their expense.
9. Insure that some entity will redeem responsibility for maintenance across the private lands.

Respondent (B): Thank you very much for finally beginning to repair the road. The sooner it is done the better I will like it! I had hoped the bridge repairs would be part of your plan, but any access is better than no access.

Respondent (C):

1. Only resurfacing the bridge in question will not solve the problem.
2. Who is responsible for maintaining the bridges and roadway through private property?

Respondent (D):

1. There may be a problem with the riprap not extending long enough to protect the toe of the road during a highwater event that cuts the corner off the Westside of the streambank.
2. Concerned about bridge number 5 on Indian Creek Road. This has been a problem for at least 30 years with water running over and around the bridge. Concerned about bridge washing out and causing resource damage on private land.
3. Should consider reroute above washout using the Brushy Gulch Road.

Respondent (E):

1. It appears that a State of Idaho Stream Alteration Permit would be required for this project.

Respondent (F):

1. Please include me on your mailing list for this project.

Respondent (G):

1. Concerned about the bridges and their poor conditions.
2. Consider routes other than the Indian Creek road to access the Indian Creek road above the washout.
3. Concerned about sediment entering the stream during construction.
4. Concerned about the cost of replacing or repairing the bridges.
5. We question what authority the Forest Service has to expend federal tax dollars on the repair of a Lemhi County right-of-way.
6. We do not believe the project is environmentally sound, economically justified, or needed to provide public access to the area.
7. We are concerned about the spread of noxious weeds with implementation of the project.
8. Concerned about heavy traffic on the road during construction and potentially after the construction.
9. Concerned about increase traffic through private property, potential damage to and failure of the various bridges on private property, litter, individuals not obeying the no-trespassing signs, parking and trespassing on private land, and other problems that happen with public traversing through private property.
10. There are questions of jurisdiction of the road that need to be resolved.

Respondent (H):

1. Concerned about the bridges and their poor conditions and the maintenance responsibilities and cost.
2. Concerned about the maintenance of the road.

Respondent (I):

1. Strongly supports the reconstruction of the Indian Creek road washout
2. Access to private property above the road washout has been greatly reduced.